

The Republican.

No. 14. Vol. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Oct. 13, 1826. [Price 6d.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

POLITICAL economy is the science of politics, or human and social policy divested of all relations to mere political parties. It is the good divested of the evil of politics. It embraces and teaches the welfare of all classes, from the monarch, where a monarch is tolerated, to him who labours for the smallest amount of wages. It admits not of party feeling; for where party interest begins, political economy ends. Political economy is the interest of the public as a whole. It has been excluded from nearly all Monarchical and Aristocratical Governments, and hence the sufferings of the labouring people under such Governments, and under an ignorance of the science of political economy.

Political economy is the science of profits—the profit of labour, of rent, of exchange, and it has the harmonizing quality of seeking to equalize or to regulate the profits of all classes of industrious people or capitalists upon that basis on which the greatest aggregate and most diffusive profit can be raised. It is the science of the welfare of mankind.

Economy, in its derivative sense, expresses a *saving* or frugality in the management of things, and so far the words *political economy* do not express fully the science which is discussed under that name; for it is rather the science of increased and increasing means, than of the proper use of means already produced. It embraces the frugal use of present productions; but it goes farther, it teaches how they may be increased and applied to the general benefit. It teaches rulers what is the source of national prosperity, as well as the ruled what is the source of individual prosperity, and that the one can only exist with the other.

Hitherto, political economy has not been studied as a science among rulers. The state of things has been economy among the labouring people and lavish expenditure with the rulers, so that the economical means of the one party have been destroyed by the lavish expenditure of the other, and extensive poverty has been the consequence. The science which is called political eco-

nomny endeavours to combine the interests of the rulers with those of the ruled. It admits every kind of improvement in the system of legislating and governing, without admitting any change for mere party purposes. It is the only ground on which politicians of all parties can honestly unite; for it removes them from every ground of dispute, as each theory can be easily put to the test of practice. It is owing to the spread of this science, it is through the circumstance that the science has been slightly countenanced by some of the present Ministers of Government, that we see less of party and hostile feeling in the Legislature; that, on many weighty matters, there has been a unity of feeling, so rare, between the "Gentlemen on the Treasury benches" and the "Gentlemen opposite."

So far, then, the science of political economy promises to be an unmixed good: and though those, who have not examined what it means, may attempt to throw ridicule upon it, as every thing useful to mankind has been ridiculed by some, on its first presentation; like every other real science, it has an immoveable basis, so long as human animals congregate into a society. It is the science of social human welfare.

The foregoing paragraphs are prefatory of the intention to reduce the science called political economy to a style and compass that shall be within the comprehension and means of all who have labour whereby they can profit. Political economy embraces the application of all other sciences or discoveries to the promotion of human happiness. Discoveries, in science, avail not, unless they be made applicable to the increase or perpetuation of this happiness. Machinery of all kinds adds to the amount of happiness; but great momentary outcries are made against it, because, and merely because, it changes momentarily the position of the demand for labour with a few, though it increases that demand in the aggregate. An illustration of this position will be attempted in the following case:—

Population, not injured by machinery, but by excessive taxation.

"The Times" newspaper, of the 10th inst. contains a petition from some distressed people of Frome, in Somersetshire, to the King, against the use of machinery; and, contrasted with it, some Kingly expenditures of the day, upon palaces, evidently meaning to shew the reader and the poor petitioners, that the extravagance on the one side causes the distress on the other. The paper has also some comments upon the subject, which are truly Republican in their style, allowing for the sarcastic or ironical attribution of virtues and political sympathy to the King, and these also, I copy, to complete the subject, intending to finish it by a few observations on machinery and the present state of things in this coun-

try: a state of gorgeous show and luxurious habit, on the one side, supported by taxation, breeding distress, disease, and death, by starvation, on the other.

R. C.

A CONTRAST.

DISTRESS AT HOME.

THE following is the substance of a petition to His Majesty, presented by a deputation of the Committee, on the part of the distressed inhabitants of Frome:—

TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN.—We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal lieges of the town of Frome, in the county of Somerset, emboldened by that enlightened liberality which has uniformly marked the public actions of your reign, and encouraged by the grace and urbanity so pre-eminently conspicuous in every instance of your private munificence, most humbly beg leave to lay at the foot of your Majesty's throne, a plain and unvarnished statement of our grievances.

We approach your sacred person in a time of unprecedented distress—when ruin, with all its baleful attendants, is making rapid and fearful advances on all the middle and lower classes of your people. A number of untoward circumstances, over which they had no controul, have long been in active operation, and have materially contributed to increase the weight and to aggravate the pressure of the present unparalleled distress. But while we deprecate the idea of soliciting your Majesty on certain consequences which no human prudence could anticipate or prevent, and which, though painful, are still remote, we feel it to be our duty, and we rejoice in it as our privilege, that we are permitted to call your Majesty's attention to that most fatal and prolific of all evils, the universal application of mechanical force, and the unlimited adoption of recent hurtful inventions in the several branches and departments of the woollen trade. It is to these, Sire, that the aggregate of suffering and distress, now so alarmingly prevalent in all your manufacturing districts, may be principally, if not entirely, attributed.

It is with feelings of the most poignant sorrow and regret that we behold the melancholy depression which the excess of machinery has occasioned in all the middle and lower classes. Formerly, an order for a greater or smaller number of woollen cloths was esteemed as a general good by the neighbourhood where the master manufacturer resided, and all the honest and industrious persons employed by him were benefited thereby, and thus a reciprocity of interests, a mutual and common concern, which tended to the advantage of master and man, was kept up. But now, Sire, the natural and proper order of things is reversed: the manufacturer receives his orders, and they are executed without the intervention or concurrence of his discarded workmen; and thus, in the woollen trade alone, there are upwards of sixty thousand operatives, loyal and true men, thrown out of their customary employment; and if two-thirds of these are fathers of families, averaging four children each, the total of discarded, or only partially employed, will amount to two hundred and sixty thousand cast out and despaired, a burden to themselves, and comparatively useless to society.

Your Majesty will be told, perhaps, "that every possible application of mechanical force is absolutely necessary, in order to enable us to compete with our foreign rivals." Now we earnestly entreat your Majesty to consider the true causes of that rivalry, if such there be; we also beg leave to direct your Majesty's attention to the high rate of per centage which our woollen goods are liable to, before they can be admitted into foreign ports, and to the comparatively small amount of our export woollen trade, only one-eighth of the cloths manufactured, including what is sent to our own colonies and dependencies; and if the enormous quantity of cotton wool, and of every species of machinery exported, be taken into account, it must be obvious that our manufacturers have no foreign rivalry to dread, inasmuch as it is plain that foreigners are now manufacturing for themselves. But even if it were not so, it comports with true wisdom and sound policy, to give up a few points of hopeless and unprofitable competition, if by so doing you find employment for your discarded and starving operatives.

The injudicious encouragement given to every species of machinery, however hurtful, has an obvious tendency to foster high and aristocratical feelings in a certain order of men; while it manifestly tends to degrade and pauperize the great body of your people; it stands directly opposed to every principle of justice and humanity, is destructive to manly independence, and subversive of individual and national prosperity, and is alike inimical to true wisdom and sound policy, as it goes to estrange, where it does not wholly alienate the affection which Englishmen were wont to cherish for their country, and will, if persisted in, most assuredly lead to the subversion of order, or ultimately end in a total obliteration of the national character.

For these urgent and plain reasons, which we deduce from a practical and experimental acquaintance with the evils of which we speak, we, your Majesty's loyal and afflicted lieges, implore your Majesty to impose such wholesome and necessary restrictions on all recent and injurious inventions, generally, and in particular on gigs, shearing-frames, and the whole dressing apparatus, on power single-handed spring broad looms and mules, as shall seem meet to your Princely and Royal wisdom to direct.

And your Petitioners will ever pray.

ROYAL BUILDINGS.

Account of the sums expended for the repairs and alterations of Windsor Castle; and an estimate of the sum that will be required to complete the contemplated works:—

The amount expended in the repairs and alterations of Windsor Castle, already undertaken, up to May, is	£122,500
The estimated amount of the sum which will be required to complete the whole of the works which have been sanctioned by the Commissioners appointed in 1824, to superintend the repairs and improvements at Windsor Castle, is	127,500
	<hr/>
	250,000

This amount is 100,000*l.* more than the estimate for the same work, submitted to, and sanctioned by, the commissioners.

Account of the sum already expended for the building of Buckingham Palace; and an estimate of the account that will be required to complete the building and improvements of the grounds about it:—

The amount expended on account of the building of Buckingham Palace, to the 5th of April, 1826	£90,371
The estimated amount of the sum which will be required to complete the building and improvements of the ground round about it, is	162,319
	<hr/> 252,690

Estimate of the cost of the alterations and additions to the King's Palace, in St. James's-park.—June 20, 1825.

FOR THE BUILDING.

Raising the floors of the basement story 2½ feet	£4,200
Raising the ground-floor 5 feet	5,800
Taking down the wings, forming the quadrangle, and rebuilding them further back, and forming a colonnade on each side	24,000
Extending the colonnades to the proposed depth of the quadrangle, and building wings to the eastern extremity	9,000
The entrance archway and circular railing (proposed sculpture of the archway not included)	8,900
The portico and porte-cochere, and alterations of the entrance front (except sculptured pediments)	6,600
The chapel (not gilt)	7,500
The hall and great staircase, including the carving and gilding the capitals and mouldings	9,200
The gallery, including carving and gilding the mouldings	4,900
The lower gallery, including carving and gilding the mouldings and capitals	3,800
The new roof	9,400
The raising the library-building, and the other side corresponding with it	10,600
The alterations of the interior of the house, and the general repairs of the parts not altered	18,000
The raising the building fronting the flower-garden [north front]	3,500
The new buildings in the west front, including carving and gilding the mouldings, and exclusive of sculptured ornaments	49,000
The terraces and pavilions of the north and west fronts	9,000
External domestic offices, court-yards, drains, sewers and cesspools	13,000
For omissions, casualties, &c.	3,600

Supplementary estimate of additions to the original Plans.—Oct. 10, 1825.

Additional buildings forming an entrance to the palace from Pimlico, and the removal of the gates into the Park	£9,600
Additional domestic offices next Pimlico, and forming a kitchen entrance with gates for waggons and carts	5,600
Forming a private court-yard on the north side of the buildings from the Park, and continuing a gallery from the portion of the said court-yard, along the north side of the buildings forming the yard, to communicate with the buildings fronting the flower-garden for the private use of his Majesty	6,400
The raising the range of buildings fronting the flower-garden an additional story	3,600
Widening the building in the west front, between the centre building and the wings on each side	3,600
Repeating the colonnade and steps of the south end of the hall at the north end, and forming an entrance to the gallery at the end	1,600
	<hr/> 230,400

FOR THE GROUNDS.

Forming the ornamental water, and the mound to screen the buildings ; puddling the ornamental water to secure it from leakage	£74,700
Making drains to drain the wharfs, and a sewer to convey the superabundant water, and underdraining the whole of the gardens	1,520
Making a brick reservoir at Hyde-park-corner, to supply the house and grounds with water from the Serpentine	3,500
Work done and doing for altering ground and planting	3,200

£262,690

Sculpture not included, except capitals, friezes, and cornices. Estimate prepared by Mr. Nash :—The chimney-pieces parquette, and best floors, Scagliola columns, chimney-pieces, slabs, and wood carving at Carlton House, have been considered as used again ; also the screen of columns on the wall has been considered as forming the pavilions at the ends of the terrace, and the great stairs to furnish the king's private stairs ; but the timber, bricks, lead, slates, and common floors, have not been considered as applicable to the new palace.

OBSERVATIONS BY THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES."

WE have just read a touching petition to his Majesty from the distressed inhabitants of Frome, in the West of England, who pray on behalf of more than 60,000 of their unemployed brethren, the journeymen of the woollen manufacture, for some small glimmering of royal beneficence and protection. When these poor men beseech their sovereign "to impose restraints on all recent and injurious inventions," as a means of superseding machinery by manual toil, it is needless to say how widely they mistake the nature and causes of the visitation under which they suffer. Whatever tends to lower the cost of production in any country, whether with respect to the necessities of life or its indulgencies, constitutes a direct encouragement to trade, and an eventual extension of the market for skill and industry. The cure, therefore, which the journeymen of Frome and its vicinity solicit at the hands of their most gracious sovereign, is a nostrum which would fail of its effect. But what is that to the purpose ? Is the patient's malady less real, because the proper treatment of it lies beyond his reach ? Is a man less likely to expire of hunger, because he unconsciously importunes his friend for poison instead of wholesome aliment ?

Let the men of Somerset implore his Majesty to take measures for lowering the price of bread and meat, by a previous reduction of those dreadful imposts which form the true and paramount obstacles to a restoration of our national prosperity ; and they will speak a language which must find an immediate echo in the enlightened judgment, and humane disposition of the King.

But our poor countrymen, who are shrewd and intelligent in the use of their natural reason, may answer with much appearance of justice, that the taxes which press upon them cannot be reduced, so long as the Parliament stands pledged to maintain a voluminous list of military and civil establishments, and to execute a variety of "indispensable" undertakings, sufficient, in fact, to require the whole sum, and more than all, that can be reckoned upon as the result of our system of taxation, however prolific

its amount. The sufferers ought to frame their petitions, therefore, with a view to engage the Royal attention in an inquiry into the nature and necessity of those multifarious objects, for and through which they have no doubt a general idea that the money raised in taxes is consumed. We can ourselves supply them occasionally with materials for such a prayer to the Sovereign. There are, we grieve to say, plans for employing the revenue exacted from the poor in England in manifold but circuitous imposts upon every article of human convenience and enjoyment, to which the people themselves are blind, from the ignorance appertaining to their humble condition, and from the indifference growing out of hard and desperate want. Of many of these schemes of expense it is easy to imagine that our gracious Monarch is also retained in a state of ignorance, equal to that of the most oppressed and broken-hearted of his subjects, by the dexterous artifices of men in power, who well understand what would be their own fate, if even by accident a remote suspicion should cross the mind of a Prince so generous, that there are hourly wasted in wreckless prodigality, sums more than sufficient, if well employed, to save whole thousands and ten thousands of brave but prostrate Englishmen, with their wives and infants, in whom the consciousness of life itself is prematurely quickened by the agonies of hunger. The King can know nothing of these abominations. It is therefore to gain for our petitioning fellow-subjects an alliance so powerful, and a sympathy so delightful, as that of their common friend and father, that we present them with a copy of a document, believed to be official,—an official but scarcely credible document, professing to be an estimate of sums expended and to be expended, on the building, repairing, and adorning of a number of *Royal Palaces*. The malice of those with whom such projects have originated, will be seen at once to derive immeasurable aggravation from the expedient of connecting the name of our excellent Sovereign with the ruin of his people, at a time so awful as that which now threatens to overwhelm both him and the community. We repeat, that it is quite dreadful to reflect on the stratagem of devising jobs for ministerial creatures, and palming them upon the nation as so many methods of diverting the Royal cares, or of animating the *ennui* of an existence, which, on this side the grave, can have no new occupation but that of preparing for another. How must it rouse the virtuous indignation of HIS MAJESTY, to learn, that, in his name, behind his back, in defiance of his inevitable displeasure, and contempt for his tender affection towards a broken-down people, there are persons who place to the account of his Royal pleasure an outlay of more than HALF A MILLION sterling, for throwing down, building up, carving, gilding, decorating palaces, excavating hills, elevating vallies, making earth and water change places, with a hundred other extraordinary metamorphoses,—as if these were days for lavish profusion—as if this day, on which five hundred thousand people are starving, was a fit one for the utter demolition of five hundred thousand pounds. Ninety thousand pounds have been expended on Buckingham Palace! and there is called for, *in addition*, the sum of one hundred and sixty-two thousand pounds! There is, besides all this, another palace, and near the same spot. A grand house, it appears, was projected by one, whose name we shall hold sacred, as a residence for the Duke of YORK. The illustrious Duke borrowed money from a friend, to enable him to commence this palace. The loan was absorbed in little more than the foundations of the edifice, and where was another loan to be obtained? Alas! nowhere. The illustrious personage, after a long course of anxiety and of bodily suffering, increased, we have no doubt, by sharp uneasiness of mind, had recourse at length to that expedient which

seldom fails where Royal distresses are to be mitigated. The Cabinet was appealed to; the "dead weight" was taken off the shoulders of the Heir Presumptive, and it was agreed that the labour which he could not execute should be accomplished for him. This vast Corinthian building was bought *from* his Royal Highness, that it might be given to him. It was not merely taken off his hands, but as the history goes, the mortgage was first cleared off, and the house was to be finished by Government, for the purpose of being forthwith restored to the Heir Presumptive: then, as the account goes, the interest of His Royal Highness in the lease from the Crown, was bought from him, that Ministers might have a right to grant him leave to live in the habitation, from the embarrassment of which they relieved him—and thus his Royal Highness is on his legs again. Other debts are said to have been discharged with money given out of the public treasury, for these over-mortgaged premises. And what addition has been made thereby to the half million voted for the palaces, properly speaking, royal, we shall doubtless hear, before many weeks have elapsed. We repeat, however, our firm conviction, that when these proceedings are fairly submitted to HIS MAJESTY, and placed in proper *juxta-position*, with the complaints and remonstrances of his much-suffering people, such a perversion of the means of procuring bread will be at once rebuked and countermanded, and the frightful consequence averted of so daring and unseasonable a public wrong.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

If we admit all that the alarmists about machinery advance or ask, as to the injury which it does to the labourer, we ask them in turn, whether the attempt to check the invention, manufacture, and use of machinery, would not be the greater of the two evils; whether other countries, with less taxes, America for instance, would not improve machinery and profit by our stupidity; and whether, if such were the case, either by an open or a smuggled trade, their production and sale of an article, at a small price, would not operate in the same ratio to lessen the demand for hands to produce it at home, as it is assumed that machinery has done.

But, says Thomas Single and others, allow the free use of machinery and tax its producing powers up to the point of subsistence to the labourer, whose demand for labour is lessened. Do so, and you will have no market for your taxed article, if other people can use machinery without the tax. Prevent the use of machinery, or tax its means of cheap production, and you will produce precisely the effect, or a worse effect, than that, which you wish to counteract. The advantage of machinery is cheap production; the advantage of cheap production is greater consumption; the advantage of greater consumption is a more active state of commerce and more personal comforts, the advantage and comfort of clean garments instead of filthy rags.

It has been asserted, and proofs to the contrary have been

challenged, that, in no one manufacture, say of woollen, cotton, linen, or silk goods, has the introduction of machinery lessened the aggregate number of individuals before employed in that manufacture. Individuals or numbers might have been thrown out of employ for a time; but other individuals or numbers have received a demand for more active labour. Machinery rather changes the position of the demand for labour than lessens labour; and it is this change of position that creates all the clamour which we hear against machinery, a clamour, which though it be founded on distress, arises from a mistaken view of the cause of that distress. It is a clamour misapplied, and, as such, can produce no beneficial change.

If the spinning jenny have removed the spinning wheel, it has but made the worker in iron one of the necessary labourers for the production of wearing apparel. A spinning wheel was merely the work of a day; a jenny the work of weeks to a number of hands, with a constant demand for repairs. Therefore, in the demand for labour for the production of wearing apparel, the smith is now wanted instead of the spinner.

To say, that these changes ought not to be allowed, or to say that compensation should be made from the taxes to those who suffer from such changes, is to raise barriers to the common welfare. In all changes of long existing circumstances, there will be individuals who gain and individuals who lose. It is the foundation of commerce and of all social relations. The principle is a natural one; for health and stability, whether in an animal, a vegetable, a mineral, or a planet, consist of unimpeded motion of the parts among each other, that constitute the whole, and an exchange of parts with other bodies. The change, the motion, is the life of the thing, its food, its preservation.

The grower of wheat says to the community, "you ought not, and shall not, if I can influence the legislature, buy any other wheat than that which, by tillage, I produce, and, for that you shall pay me a profitable price, even if a neighbour, belonging to another community a few miles off, can supply you at the half of that price."

That is evidently unfair, cries the manufacturer. To support you, your landlord, your tithe and tax gatherer, I must give a double price for my bread.

And I, cries the agriculturist, do not I pay you, in the same proportion, for my wearing apparel?

The inference, then, must be, that our mutual produce is doubly taxed, compared with the taxation of similar produce among our neighbours. Can we support each other, upon any scale of prices?

No, cries the manufacturer, your consumption is not equal to my power of production, and I must seek a foreign market; to do which, I must partake of what these foreigners produce. I,

therefore, require a free importation of corn, that the foreign exporters may have wherewith to purchase my goods.

And if you import corn, cries the agriculturist, where am I to find a market for mine, taxed as I am? What other people can meet my price? None. Our mutual remedy is, then, clearly confined to a levelling of our taxation to the amount of taxation in other countries.

It is clear, there is no other means for our mutual support.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

SIR,

YOUR correspondent, J. F. says:—"F. P. has withdrawn from the contest." This was news to me; for I did not know that I had entered into a contest with J. F. He quarrelled with an article which you copied from "The Bolton Chronicle;" but that did not make me a party in what he calls "the contest." J. F. commenced his attack by acknowledging his ignorance of the subjects treated in the essay which you copied; but apparently forgetting this avowal, he soon made his ignorance manifest by his presumption. It is a little too much in any man to talk as J. F. has done, and then to expect replies to his crudities. Those were reasons quite sufficient to prevent my taking any notice of what he said; but there were other reasons quite as potent as these. It is evident, J. F. did not comprehend what he read, and it is equally evident, that he reasons incorrectly; that he imputes motives and calls names, and thus takes the matter from the broad and useful basis on which it was placed, and puts it upon the narrow and useless, not to say pernicious basis of a mere personal dispute, into which no man who really meant to do good to the working classes, and knew what he was about, would enter.

If those of your readers who pay attention to the important subjects of "Machinery and Population" will read over all that J. F. has written, and then read the essay from "The Bolton Chronicle" they will find it a reply to all that J. F. has said respecting it. J. F. should read a good deal and think a good deal more than he has hitherto done, even in justice to himself, before he presumes to teach others.

Political economy is the science of the working people; nothing but a knowledge of its leading principles, aided by their own prudence, can ever rescue them from the degradation into

which—they have not fallen—but from which they have never been able to emerge.

Political economists are necessarily friends of the working people ; the very end and object of the science is to elevate them, procure for them the greatest possible share of the produce of their labour ; but, like all others who have attacked vulgar prejudices, political economists must expect to be attacked, and, if it were in the power of those they seek to serve, to be persecuted by them, and this has been the state, and not unfrequently the fate of all reformers ; this political economists know : but as they are sincere in their desire to be useful, and fully convinced that the principles they endeavour to expound cannot fail to be useful, no vituperation, no ascription of motives will deter them from steadily pursuing their course. If their doctrines be sound, they will, in time, be embraced by those whom they seek more particularly to serve, as they are at present by the most enlightened of those who have taken the pains necessary to comprehend them. If they be unsound, they will be exposed and refuted, and better doctrines substituted in their place. Political economists have but one wish, and that is, that whatever may upon the whole be best calculated to promote the “ greatest happiness of the greatest number ” should be adopted.

A small, low priced book, containing so much of the principles of political economy as most immediately affects the working people is much wanted, and, should I be able to apply as much time to the subject as may be necessary—which, I, however, fear I shall not—I will, with your permission, Mr. Editor, do what I can towards furnishing such a book.

My plan would be to supply a series of essays for “ The Republican,” which might afterwards be worked off as a pamphlet, and sold separately. It should consist of an introduction—containing a general view of the science ; to be followed by Essays on Rent of Land—Capital and Profit—Wages—Population—Taxation, including Tithes and Corn Laws—and, a summary of the whole. This might be comprised in four sheets of letter press. Might be sold at fourpence a sheet, and as a volume in boards for two shillings, and even for a smaller sum, were the purchasers likely to become numerous.

Such a book would serve as a manual to those who could not afford to purchase larger works, and as an introduction to those who could.

F. P.

WHAT IS GOD ?—No. II.

Principio cælum ac terras camposque liquentes
 Lucentemque globum Lunæ Titaniaque astra
 Spiritus intus alit, totamque, infusa per artus,
 Meus agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet.

I HAVE already considered God to be the moving power of the universe, or more properly, to be the universe itself, comprehending matter, or the substratum which excites our sensations—life, or the motion superadded—and mind, or the source of that motion; and this seems to be an opinion that agrees with the doctrine of the ancient philosophers, and which the poets of Greece and Rome embodied in their poetical descriptions and didactic songs. The quotation from Virgil above, contains the substance of the doctrine of the Schools on the universe expressed in very appropriate language. For here the material mass or *moles* is considered as supported by the *spirit* or breath of life, and the whole agitated or kept in motion by *mind*. I grant that all this is hypothetical, but it seems the best of all the hypotheses. At an earlier period the sun and the spirit of fire were regarded as God, because at that time men professed not that more extensive acquaintance with remote suns which astronomy subsequently taught, and the sun, or our system of planets, was regarded as containing within itself the causes of all those phenomena which were produced by his light. The worship of the sun, the air, and the elements, is certainly the most ancient worship we are acquainted with, and it gave rise to the custom of building cities and temples in the form of a cross—the principal gate being to the east, and consequently the other three great gates would correspond to the remaining three points of the compass. Not only the great cities of the East, but our own English and French towns, and indeed most of the oldest towns of Europe, have the great streets running east and west, north and south, and contain therefrom evident marks of ancient astro-theology and the worship of the sun. In the grand invocations of the elements in some of the Greek tragedian choruses, we find evidence of the popularity of the same worship; and we may discover by the history of all religions that grew out of and were modified and simplified by our progressive knowledge of astronomy, and of the phenomena of the atmosphere, such were the basis of the polytheism of ancient Egypt, Greece, and Rome: and it possessed this great advantage over the theology of modern Europe, that the Deities of the Greeks and Romans were personifications of the general powers of Nature, and are therefore capable of a physical expla-

nation—while the Gods of the Christians, though springing, like the former, originally out of astronomy, are now purely imaginative beings, formed by man in the image of his own imperfect nature, endowed with his worst passions, and hidden from the ken of the multitude by a veil of mystery; by means of which, Priestcraft, backed by Tyranny, preys on ignorance, and cheats the unwary out of the goods of life on the pretext of procuring them a reward in a fictitious Paradise, more abstrusely absurd and unmeaning than its prototype, the Elysian Fields of the ancients.

The selfish maxim of Christian charity is, that *he that gives to the Priest, lends to the Lord*, and that for goods given to others on earth, we are to have a 7 per cent. interest in Heaven. And the sensible proverb, that *a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush*, has not yet beat it out of the brains of many speculative Evangelicals to lend money on such terms of usury, and to avow openly that their charity is *not* the good Samaritan's, but is done to save or to help their own souls, and procure for them a better place in the kingdom to come. Now the Jupiters and Dianas of antiquity made no such stipulations. There is however a great resemblance between the manner the heroes of old Greece and the saints of new Rome were disposed of: *Viam adfectere Olympo* was a sort of classical *getting to Heaven*, and in the posthumous disposal of great souls, held out as a matter of encouragement to living subjects, there is a wonderful similarity between *stellification* and *canonization*; as there is also between Patron Genii and Patron Saints, between *Natal Genii* and *Guardian Angels*, and between all the festivals and ceremonies of Paganism and those of Christianity. But I must reserve this subject for my HISTORY OF ALL THE GODS, and my KEY TO ALL THE CALENDARS, in the sequel. And for the present go on to state my mode of reasoning on the hypothesis of an intelligent God.

All the changes of figure which matter undergoes, which become the objects of our sensations, and which we can individualize, and call phenomena, i. e. appearances, seem to take place by means of what we call motion: and all motions seem determined by fixed laws. I have asserted, and I maintain it, that it is inconsistent with the nature of the human mind, be it by means of the organ of causality, or by what other name you please to designate it,—to consider matter as originating its own motion, the cause of motion is therefore what I mean by mind. Now the word *Deity* is, to me, only a sort of algebraical sign for the centre of all the motion of the whole universe taken collectively; and such has ever been the opinion of the greatest and most reflecting philosophers of every age and country. In this view of the subject, I assert the existence of a Deity in opposition to Atheism; and I shall proceed to examine this notion in reference to various physical sciences; and examine the consistency of the hypothesis with all positive knowledge which seems

to me the only right way of proving the truth or falsehood of our opinions. For it is trying the truth of hypothetical or assumed causes, by examining their capability of explaining, or their agreement with positive sensations or effects. It is in this very same way that the Newtonian System is tried. It has been established on the ground of its consistent adaptation to all known effects. We see not, nor feel, *attraction* or *repulsion*, and the Newtonian System is only verified by demonstrating its power to solve the problems of the causes correctly of what we do see and know of the celestial mechanism.

This idea struck me long ago when examining the discoveries of Sir William Herschell in the higher department of astronomy. As the most correct physical facts may be known and predicted by calculations founded on the hypothesis of attractions, and the established laws of motion in mathematics, so great metaphysical truths may be established on the hypothesis of causes emanating from one intelligent source, and giving thereby a unity of design to the whole fabric of the universe; and this is the opinion that I have attempted to establish. In physics we can no more see the centre of gravity than we can in metaphysics see the centre of causation. Both are hypothetical, but I contend that the one as well as the other will serve for the solution of questions relating to the origin and changes of *simple objects*, and will enable us to predict the occurrence or periodical return of phenomena. Both proceed, likewise, on the supposition, that the laws of nature are everywhere the same; are constant, regular, and unchangeable; without which supposition there could be no such thing as certainty in philosophy.

All our knowledge is founded on sensations, and I admit that we do not see causes, but we see their effects; and our knowledge of the causes is the necessary effect of ratiocination. What renders a belief in causation a correct belief is, that calculations founded thereon turn out to be true. We do not, in the mathematics, see either points or lines, nor attractions, nor centres of gravity, yet all good calculations founded on these hypothetical existences, turn out in the result to be correct, and furnish all that grand and imposing astronomical prophecy on which our almanacks and ephemerides are founded.

I know it is the fashion, now-a-days, to dispute the *Newtonian System*, and I, for one, am ready to assert, and I have asserted at Cambridge and elsewhere, that its purity is an assumed and unproved, though not an unsupported, hypothesis; it derives its support from the circumstance of its perfect agreement with all the existing phenomena of moving bodies with which we have as yet become acquainted: from the fact that all other known explanations of the phenomena involve contradiction and absurdity; and from our never being disappointed by any failure in the subsequent occurrence of such phenomena as calculation founded

on the Newtonian hypothesis has previously led us to expect. I shall endeavour further to illustrate the notion of hypothetical existences by referring the reader to what happens in certain specific calculations. In examining, for example, binary and complex and siderial systems, do we not assume their revolution round hypothetical or empty centres; at the same time do we not find that such hypotheses are capable of explaining clearly and consistently all the observeable movements of the heavenly bodies under consideration. Now, I say, in a more extended sense, that a central source of causation is, likewise, hypothetical, but it is an hypothesis whose validity is to be sought for in its application to sensible phenomena.

Now observe, I only compare *attraction* as a cause particular, with *Deity* as a cause in general, inasmuch as they are both objectionable hypotheses, and do not contradict the phenomena they are assumed to explain. Both, too, may be imitated and viewed on a small scale of effects before our eyes. The pendulum in describing areas equal to the times, and the magnet in drawing the piece of steel, and the two concurrent cork balls in water, illustrate the greater attractive forces which hold the planetary globes in their orbits, while man and animals, like small fragments and dwarf illustrations of greater hypothetical powers of volition, may give us the idea of an immense source of motion, and fountain of intelligence. The ancients spoke of the whole sum of human and animal intelligence together, and called it *Divinæ partium auræ*.

The notions that I entertained on these subjects when almost a child differed very little from those I now possess, except in extension, and the subsequent multiplication of examples in proof of them. I have always approximated gradually towards the conception of a deity or central cause by the examination of nature, or, in other words, effects considered as resulting from powers adequate to their production, I reasoned thus:—There is a something which causes the changes of phenomena, and that something appears to be the source of motions. All the motions, whose effects are exhibited in the theatre of our earth's habitable surface are referable, either to chemical affinities; to atmospheric influence; to vegetation; or to animal volition. But these forms, with the exception, perhaps, of volition, imply nothing more than species of motion referred by chemists and naturalists to hypothetical causes—such as chemical attraction, gravitation, magnetism, &c. While these minor motions are going on, and their proper phenomena are being exhibited, the whole existing of them are moving round the sun in a particular orbit, on the surface of our globe, revolving, at the same time, on its own axis, and existing in mutual relation to other such globes moving in other similar orbits, having also proper motions round their own axes, and some of them having, like our own globe, minor

globes or satellites moving round them, and the whole of this vast moving machine with the sun in its centre, called the solar system, is explained on the principle of another hypothetical cause of motion, which places the centre of gravity in the sun. But according to this hypothesis called Newtonian, the solar system itself must exist, in a certain relation to other solar and sidereal systems. Now between any given or assumed number of these systems, there must be a hypothetical centre of gravity. Our solar system, magnificent indeed as it is in itself, is, nevertheless, only a very minute portion of the universe. All the stars we see on a fine night can be shewn by a calculation of probabilities to be either insulated *solar systems* like our own, giving central support to planets, or else *sidereal systems* composed of two or more stars revolving round an empty common centre. The motions of all their revolving bodies are referrable and explainable on the Newtonian hypothesis. Moreover, all the stars we see with our naked eyes seem to lie within the plane of that numberless zone of stars and starmaking *nébulae* that by their joint line cause the appearance of the milky way. Each of these small stars is invisible alone without a telescope; nevertheless, the whole number together, by their conjoint influence, produce that celebrated band of light: all of these stars too are so immensely distant that their appearance to us *only affords direct evidence of their having existed many ages ago, and affords evidence by induction only of their existing now!!* A grand conception of the immensity of the universe now begins to present itself. For all the stars we see surrounded by the milky way, probably only constitute one set or system of worlds out of the countless millions of such assemblages of worlds: extending throughout infinite space, and existing for an eternity of time!!! Now, according to a hypothesis verified by its unexceptionable application to all sensible phenomena, every atom of this immense universe must exist in mutual relation with every other, and with the whole: each celestial globe, in direct proportion to its bulk and proximity, creating a disturbance in the motions of the others. Now, though the effect of any one, as of the sun for example, or the other more and more remote bodies is lost in infinity, and becomes at last inconvertant, yet I can conceive that for all existing systems taken collectively there can be a centre of motion or central cause of all the figures and orbitary mechanisms, and of all the motions or changes of figure which take place on the animated surfaces of these innumerable worlds. I assume such a hypothetical centre, and choosing the simplest form, I represent it by unity, and call it the DEITY. Any other word would do as well as a sign, but such it has been named; and in repeating it I assert, that the assumption of such a Being, considered with reference to the whole material and eternal universe is not inconsistent with any physical science, is reconcilable to all sensible phenomena, and af-

fords an agreeable mode of resolving our ignorance of the primary source of phenomena into one hypothetical centre of causation; which is better and more satisfactory to my mind, and to that of the bulk of mankind, than the habit which Atheism must generate of viewing all phenomena as passing phantoms, lawless, causeless, and devoid of universal harmony. Such then is the God, not of my idolatry, but of my hypothesis, and if you can shew it to be inconsistent with any sensible phenomena, or at variance with any known science, I will give it up. In turn, if I can shew that it is capable of a reconciliation with all phenomena which we can examine, I shall claim of you to admit it, and regard it, like the Newtonian Theory, as an unobjectionable hypothesis.

Now, if we admit a central cause, or one cause for all phenomena, that said cause must be regarded as the soul or moving principle of the universe; but this does not do away with my notions of the eternity of matter. The whole, taken collectively, is the Deity, and the Greeks were so aware of this, that they represented their PAN, or the MIGHTY ALL, or *All Mighty*, by a name that implies five, and is so applied as being, according to their philosophy, the number of *all the elements, earth, air, fire, water, and ether*, or spirit. Milton, the Deistical poet, introduces the word Pan to represent the incarnation of the *All Mighty* in the person of Christ. Pan, like Christ, became the Good Shepherd, the *ovium custos*, and that too by a similar sort of personification, among those who mistook the ancient philosophy, or who wished to convert it to their own purposes.

Matter then is an *Eternal Necessity*, that sets bounds to the moving power, and that must deprive philosophers of an Almighty God, and strip the Divinity of his pretended omnipotence. For *God the Universe cannot alter his nature*. Now the God of Grace, or the imaginary GREAT DO GOOD, is a term which signifies the perception of an apparent *design* in Nature for the production of happiness, which the resistance of matter seemed to prevent by affording obstructions to perfection; and thus were suggested the terrifying personification of the Devil, or GREAT DO EVIL. I can cite Saxon and Gothic authorities for this assertion, and for the etymology of God and Devil. But the facts of their history are plain.

Nature signifies *that which is about to be*, and represents the phenomena of the universe in the relation of cause and effect as one eternal and unchangeable chain of events. Nature is therefore the manifestation of the secret power of the great ALL, and thus Chaucer truly calls her

“Nature, the Vicar of the Almighty Lorde.”

So much for God. Now with respect to ourselves, we perceive that nothing is really destroyed, but only changes its form. And
Vol. XIV. No. 14.

therefore we shall only change our forms as far as relates to our bodies, my hand may in 500 years be part of a cow's tail, for example. But now comes the question which Shakspeare calls

"To be, or not to be?"

In the brain there is a *capacity for sensation*, which we call our minds. Will this capacity by the change which we call death be destroyed, or merely be changed? The question is one of immense difficulty as to its solution. To help us on with it, I assert, in the first place, that Locke was wrong in placing *personal identity* in remembrance. *Identity* does not necessarily imply *recollected identity*. Am I not the same being as I was when a child, a sentient being of a year old, too long ago for me now to remember any thing? Now whether this, which the French call *mon moi*, this same said *self*, this which *sensates* or *perceives* all the sensible qualities of external bodies, which communicates with other sentient beings, recollects past sensations, and reasons on its own power, and its own existence and identity, will survive the wreck of that organization on which its powers are now manifested and its relations with the external world established, is a question that I have discovered no mode of reasoning capable of furnishing a satisfactory reply to. This I know, that all the fabled theologies and metempsychoses of antiquity are mere creatures of the human imagination; and I hope in subsequent Numbers of your excellent medium of free enquiry, "The Republican," to give some curious details of the history of the Gods and Goddesses, Angels, Demons, and Devils, of all religions, and to shew, *how airy nothing has acquired a local habitation and a name*. Meanwhile, to all childish questions of posthumous futurity, I reply with Simonides,

Ω και τέλος μεν Ζευς έχει βαρυκτυπος
Παντων οσ' εστι.

I am yours, &c.

O. O.

Oct. 8, 1826.

INCONVENIENCE AND IMMORALITY OF OATHS.

"THE REPUBLICAN" has often exclaimed against the vice of oathmaking, and has shewn it to be wholly unnecessary, where the same penalties apply to falsehood as to what is called false-swearing. This practice of legislative oathmaking is the first

principle and exemplar of that habit which is termed profane swearing. The importance attached to the one keeps the other in countenance. Specimens of the absurdity of oathmaking before magistrates frequently occur, one of which is the following, taken from the Times newspaper of the 11th inst. The case before the magistrate was one of casual assault, where the parties charged each other, and wherein both were held to bail. The situation of the magistrate is pitiable, where he comes in contact with such a man as Mr. Middix. It is time that this mischievous error of oathmaking be removed by the legislature.

R. C.

Before the bail for either arrived, the Baron said, that the complainant's name was not Middix at all, but Jacobs; and that he was a downright Jew, although he had been sworn on the New Testament.

Mr. CONANT asked Mr. Middix if he had given a false account of his name and religion? At this moment, Mr. Middix's father entered the office to bail his son; and the latter replied to the Magistrate's question by saying, "There is my father, Sir; he can tell you whether my name be Jacobs or Middix."

Mr. CONANT asked Mr. Middix, sen., a very respectable-looking old gentleman, the same question.

Mr. Middix, sen., handed in his printed card, and said, that was his name, "Middix;" he never bore the name of Jacobs, he said, in his life.

Mr. CONANT then asked what religion he was of?

Mr. Middix, sen., said, that he belonged to the Jewish persuasion.

"And are you of the same persuasion?" said Mr. CONANT to the son.

"Yes," said Mr. Middix, jun., "I am a Jew, and I glory in acknowledging that I am one."

Mr. CONANT then asked how, being a Jew, he could permit himself to be sworn on the New Testament.

Mr. Middix said that he really did not know which it was, the New or the Old Testament that he had been sworn upon; indeed he had no recollection of having been sworn at all.

Mr. CONANT.—Yes, you were sworn on the New Testament: if you had not been sworn, your statement as a complainant could not be heard, and you must have known that persons of your persuasion always put on their hats when being sworn, and that ceremony you did not go through.

Why, said Mr. Middix, jun. I, for my own part, regard these ceremonies but very little; I think it of no sort of consequence whether a man be sworn with his hat on or his hat off, any more than with his wig on or his wig off; or whether he swears to tell the truth with the Old or the New Testament in his hand. I deem an oath taken in any shape or form, so as it binds the conscience, equally effective with another; and I would just as soon be sworn on the Koran as on either the Bible or the Evangelists, and I can, if you wish it, Sir, give you my reasons for thinking one just as good as the other.

Then, said Mr. Conant, do you believe in the New Testament?

Mr. Middix—In part of it I do, and in part I do not; and it is just the same with the Old Testament, and I can give you sufficient reasons for the seeming inconsistency too, if you wish for them.

Mr. Conant said, that he had no wish whatever to enter into any discussion on such points, but it was clear that according to the usual forms for

swearing persons of the Jewish persuasion, he (Mr. Middix) had not been properly sworn, and he must go through that ceremony again, and repeat his complaint afresh.

Mr. Middix then put on his hat, and was resworn on the Hebrew Bible.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

SIR,

As it is possible that the subject of burying the dead in large towns, and in crowded neighbourhoods, will be brought before the Parliament in the ensuing Session, allow me to add a few facts in corroboration of what your correspondent R. H. has before stated.

The town to which I allude is Sheffield, the parish church of which is in the centre of the town. The population is about 42,000. In the churchyard, there is, an average of four burials a day. I have seen graves dug for eight or nine in one day. For the last thirty years, the bodies have been accumulating so fast, that there is scarcely room left to inter a corpse. Before a grave is dug, the Sexton has to bore with an iron skewer, about seven feet long, to ascertain whether he is likely to fall in with a fresh buried coffin. *I have seen* graves dug there not more than two feet deep. *I have seen* a grave dug in which the Sexton has cut through five, six, and seven coffins. *I have seen* coffins opened in which there has been a perfect skeleton: the teeth good, and the hair on the scalp; the coffins, in more than one instance, have been half full of corruptible matter, which the grave-digger has scooped out with a bowl. The bones have then been put into a basket, and taken into the church; the coffin has been served in the same manner, for what purpose I know not; and the stench during this time has been intolerable! *I have seen* bodies taken out of the graves early in the morning, and laid by the side of them, covered over with a little loose earth all the day, and then re-interred in the evening after a funeral. And *I have seen*, in that churchyard in a morning, indications of the resurrection-men having been at work during the night. This I did not consider an evil; but the reverse. I still adhere to a resolution made three years ago to leave my body for dissection, in preference to letting the maggots and worms dissect it. My favourite plan would be to resolve the bodies into their constituent gases by fire; and I think this may be done for a considerably less expense than the present method of disposing of them; or even taking them out of the towns for interment.

Should any persons think I have exaggerated in my statements, I would refer them to the Sheffield papers during the last six months, in which they will find repeated complaints of this nature, and plans proposed for a remedy similar to those of R. H. There is a large plot of ground attached to the new church in Sheffield for the purpose of burials, but the Bishop has refused to consecrate it because it is not enclosed! Some persons in Sheffield have seen parts of corpses dug up where the grave-digger has had to chop with his spade the flesh and earth together, to prevent people discovering what he threw out of the graves: for the churchyard is a public thoroughfare. These are real evils, and they call loudly for a remedy; which I should hope the growing intelligence of the people will effect ere long, should the legislature decline it. Every person is able to do something in this case, and one example is worth a hundred precepts.

I am, &c.

W. V. HOLMES.

October 11, 1826.

A DIALOGUE BETWEEN A PHILANTHROPIST AND A LABOURER.

(Written for the Republican.)

P. WELL, William, how does the world move with you now! I hope your prospects are mended since I saw you last.

L. My prospects are mended, Sir, but still they are disheartening. I have obtained employment, but wages are so low that I can barely make a life of it. I fear that all my exertions will not keep me from the parish; and I cannot bear the thought of that; I would sooner die than go to ask for the parish allowance.

P. I trust, William, that you will never be compelled to adopt this last resource to prolong existence. By such a step you would not only feel degraded, but you would lose what little property you now possess, your cottage and garden.

L. Ah! Sir, I am sure I could not outlive such a loss as that! This cottage was built by my father, and though the walls are made with mud, I value them as much as if they were built of marble; and I dare say they are just as warm and keep out as much wet.

P. It is natural that you should feel an attachment for the spot you have been bred on; and cold indeed must be the heart

of him who could calmly look on and see you deprived of it. But provided you get constant employment, even at your present low wages, do you not think that you may, by good management, avoid the misfortune of being forced upon the parish? Your father's wages were never high; farm labour has not been well paid for the last fifty years; but he managed to appear as respectable as any farmer in the neighbourhood.

L. That is true, Sir, but I have greater difficulties to contend with than my father had, and I fear that they will be still greater. My father did not marry till he was near forty years of age, and previous to that time he had saved enough in guineas to pay for what he could not do himself to this cottage. I am the only child he ever had; and my mother was a strong, healthy woman, who went to work as constantly as my father did. I have not been married three years, and yet have two children, and my wife in the family way again. This, Sir, makes a wide difference. My wife has been out at work only a few weeks during harvest since our marriage; and it has been a great task for me to scrape together sufficient to pay the doctor and nurse. It vexed me to see the coarse food she was forced to live on during her illness, especially the last, while for a short time I was out of employ. As my wife and I are both young, myself not twenty-three, my wife not so old, it is likely that we shall have a long family; and if such should be the case, and wages remain so low, I have no notion how we shall be able to live.

P. There are so many examples around of the ill effects of large families that you cannot do less than dread being burthened with one. But your family is yet but small, and if you choose you may confine it to its present limits.

L. Oh! Sir, I should be a new man could I be assured that my family would not increase beyond two or three. We should then do without the doctor and nurse, and my wife may obtain strength to do the work of the house if she could not work in the field. But I fear we shall never have resolution not to have any more children. During my wife's last lying-in she made me promise never more to sleep with her. She dreaded the thought of having again to undergo such sufferings, and of having more children to support out of our scanty means. I was as ready to make the promise as she was to ask it; but keeping it was another matter. We broke our promise by mutual consent; and so I think we should if we had sworn to keep it. I fear, Sir, there is no hope for us in this matter.

P. If the restricting of your family depended on your avoiding the marriage bed, or the pleasures of sexual union, I should also say there was no hope for you. The human race has ever sought those pleasures and enjoyed them in spite of the evil consequences they are oftentimes calculated to produce. But it is not neces-

sary that you should forego those pleasures to restrict your family.

L. My wife says that she will suckle her next child till it is two years old, to try whether that will prevent her having more children, as many persons say it will.

P. It is not an effectual preventative, and is besides attended with much mischief. Conception often takes place while the mother is giving suck; and after she has ceased to suckle, she is as likely to conceive as if she had not suckled beyond the ordinary time. Besides, it is often very injurious to the female constitution, and so weakens it that she scarcely regains her wonted strength afterwards. I should think you must have seen instances of this; for I know the custom is common hereabout.

L. Yes, Sir, I think I have. Our neighbour Nelly Thompson suckled her fourth child for nearly three years, and she was at last so weakly that she could scarcely leave the house; and when she appeared in the field at harvest, it was painful to look at her. She has had three children since, but all weakly: two died shortly after their birth.

P. You would certainly not like to see your wife injured in the same manner. You would rather, I should think, that she produced you a long family.

L. Sometimes women do not have children after they have suckled a child a long time; and having many children makes a woman as weakly as long suckling. The evil is the same in one case as in the other; and as I thought there was a chance with it, I agreed that my wife should suckle her next child as long as she may choose to do it. But I should be very glad to know, Sir, if there be any means by which to prevent our having more children, without risking my wife's health, as you just now hinted.

P. You can read, and I will leave you directions that will answer your purpose perfectly, if you choose to follow them. The means this little pamphlet proposes, are simple, almost devoid of expense, and effectual as a preventative; they can in no way injure health, and require but a very small portion of attention.

L. Oh! Sir, such directions will be a prize indeed! What labouring man would be burthened with a long family if he could possibly avoid it! If it cost me a tenth of my earnings and a tenth of my time, I should consider them well expended to obtain such an object! I should think, Sir, that copies of these pamphlets would be universally acceptable.

P. However useful they may be, they are not so well received as you imagine. The interest of princes, whose thrones are founded on the degradation of the people, has led them to teach the poor cottagers that they ought to give birth to all the children they can. Giving birth to children has by them been held as the first of moral duties. This high authority has had great effect on

the mass of mankind, and they are prejudiced against the adoption of means that belie the soundness of the Kingly morality. The privileged classes of society know well that it is a redundant population that enables them to live in splendour without labour, to maintain their privileges, and to tyrannize over their fellow-men. Who would join the standard of princes, if good wages awaited every one in his native land? Who would risk his life in the field of battle, if the cottage were the abode of comfort, cheerfulness, and peace? Too well do tyrants know their strong hold: they know that excess of people is the cause of distress, of ignorance, and of brutality; and they know well, too, that from a poor, ignorant, and brutal people they can alone draw forth men to support their caprices in the field of battle.

L. I have often been told that it was a great duty to rear children; but I know that it would be injurious to myself, and I cannot see how it would do good to any others. I am fond of my children, but how could I bear to see them naked and starving! I may be able to support two or three in such a way that it will do my heart good to look at them; but a few more added to them would bring us all to poverty. The dread that such may happen has hitherto been my continual torment: to look on my dear little ones, and to think that they might be reduced still lower than our present low state—even to the parish pittance or the workhouse—has often unman'd me, and I have almost wished that I had never met with a woman to my mind—that I had never become a father! No kingly morality shall prevent me from doing all I can to avoid starvation.

P. Self-preservation is the grand law of nature. As members of society, we have minor laws that claim our attention. They may be simply classed and defined thus:—To seek our own happiness so as not to injure the happiness of others—which is morality: and, To assist others in their search for happiness, even when it does not immediately benefit ourselves—which is virtue. It is very evident, that by restricting our families to the number we can comfortably support, we violate neither of those laws, but are acting in accordance with all. We have an eye to self-preservation, to our own happiness, and to the happiness of others, we do not assist to burthen society with a number of beings who cannot find employment—we do not assist in the general degradation of our species.

L. I see now, Sir, that there would be more advantages resulting from labourers restricting their families, than what they would directly receive themselves. We should get higher wages, because there would not be so many offering to work for a mere trifle.

P. Nothing can be more evident than that when wages are low, there are too many labourers. Yet this fact, evident as it is, is by some denied. On what ground it is denied, I never could

ascertain. I trust, my friend, that labourers generally will soon see the matter in a correct light, and cease to be guided by prejudices, cease to follow a line of conduct detrimental to their individual and general happiness. Another day we will talk over this subject again. For the present—farewell.

L. Farewell, Sir, and many thanks for your kindness.

P. Y.

Proof of the importance of the instruction conveyed in "EVERY WOMAN'S BOOK," in the following melancholy case of death by poison.

ON Tuesday afternoon, an inquisition was held at the sign of the City of London, the corner of Sydney-street, City-road, before Thomas Stirling, Esq., to inquire into the circumstances connected with the death of Jane Mitchell, a girl only 19 years of age.

Mr. Archibald Maxfield, surgeon, of No. 60, Snow-hill, stated, that he had known the deceased, by her occasionally calling at his shop, for four or five months past; but was not aware of her residence, until the evening of Friday last, when he was sent for to attend her at No. 5, Sydney-street. He went about 8 o'clock, and found the deceased in bed, perfectly calm and collected. She asked witness to be seated, and then informed him she had become pregnant, but wishing to conceal the circumstance from her family, to whom it would only prove a source of shame and disgust, she had been induced by the persuasion of a female friend, to swallow a drug to cause abortion. Deceased then went on to state, that she accompanied her adviser to a herb shop in Covent-garden market, and purchased a quarter of a pound of bulb of meadow saffron, which she boiled in a pint of water, and afterwards drank the liquid, one part on Thursday night, and the remainder that morning. Witness prescribed such medical treatment as he considered the case required, but without its having the desired effect, and the deceased lingered until four o'clock on Saturday morning, when she expired in the greatest agony. She persisted in her statement, that a female friend, a married woman, caused her to commit the rash act, but obstinately refused to mention her name. Witness had no reason to believe that her intellects were in the slightest degree disordered and supposed her to be about 19 years of age.

In answer to some questions by the jury, Mr. Maxfield said that the quantity of meadow saffron taken by the deceased was sufficient to destroy half a dozen lives.

Mr. George Raven, a medical student, residing with Mr. Maxfield, stated that he found deceased as described by that gentleman. He questioned her very closely, and though she acknowledged being advised to the dreadful step she had taken by a female friend, all his endeavours to ascertain the name of that friend were ineffectual. The deceased appeared quite insensible of her danger; but declared she had no other motive in taking the decoction than to cause abortion; at the same time dwelling strongly on the disgrace and infamy she had brought on her family. Witness has no doubt she died from the poisonous effect of the drug.

Mrs. Sarah Jay, sister to the deceased, stated, that on Wednesday last

the deceased was with her, and appeared in perfect health, and quite happy and comfortable. She mentioned to witness her fears that she was pregnant, but whatever her feelings might be on that subject, she contrived effectually to conceal them. Witness saw her again on Thursday, and she then appeared much the same as usual.

Mrs. Hester Bussey, of No. 5, Sydney-street, stated that the deceased had lodged with her during the last three months, and had taken the apartments as a married woman. The gentleman whom she called her husband did not reside in the house, but came occasionally. He was a middle-aged gentleman, and the deceased was about 19 or 20 years of age. On Thursday evening the deceased complained of severe illness, attended with violent vomitings, in consequence of which witness went to a druggist's, in Goswell-street, who sent something to relieve her. The deceased, however, refused to take it; and then, for the first time, explained her situation to witness, and said she had taken a drug to prevent abortion, but which, she said, she was afraid would operate very differently. Witness blamed her very much for what she had done, but not considering her in immediate danger, and the hour being very late, medical assistance was not sent for until next day, when Mr. Maxfield came. Witness had thought she observed an alteration in the manner of the deceased for some days previous to her death.

Coroner.—When deceased told you she had taken some drug, did not you endeavour to procure some medical assistance until some time the next day.

Witness.—No, Sir; it was twelve o'clock, and I thought it too late.

A Juror.—Too late! why, medical assistance can be procured any hour of the night or morning. I think you were guilty of a piece of gross and culpable neglect. By proper attention on your part, the life of the unfortunate girl might perhaps have been saved; but, on the contrary, she was suffered to linger, after she had hinted to you that she feared she was poisoned, for 18 or 20 hours, without assistance. Such conduct was most shameful.

Coroner.—Who went with her to buy the medicine?

Witness.—I do not know.

Juror.—You, yourself did not accompany her?

Witness.—I did not.

Juror.—Have you no idea who went with her or recommended her to take the meadow saffron?

Witness.—Not any; unless—that is, I think it might be—indeed I am almost sure—quite sure—that her sister, Mrs. Jay, the last witness examined, went with her.

The Coroner here observed, that from what he now saw of the transaction, it would be advisable to adjourn the inquiry. The attendance of witnesses not at present forthcoming would be necessary; and if the gentlemen of the jury were of the same opinion, those witnesses should be summoned. There seemed to be a mystery attending the unfortunate circumstance which ought to be fathomed.

The suggestion of the Coroner was immediately adopted, several of the jurors observing, that it appeared to be a case requiring the strictest investigation. They then proceeded to view the body, which only exhibited some slight discolorations of the face, the effect of convulsions.

The inquiry was then adjourned till 3 o'clock the next day, and Mr. Maxfield was requested to open the body in the interim.

At the appointed hour yesterday afternoon the same jury re-assembled, and the following additional evidence was adduced:—

The Beadle stated, That he had taken every pains to ascertain at what shop the drug was purchased, but without effect.

Mr. Maxfield, in addition to his former evidence, stated, that he had opened the body of the deceased, and found the stomach and alimentary canal very much inflamed. No change had taken place in any of the organs. Witness thinks that if assistance had been procured earlier, the stomach-pump might have been used with effect.

Mrs. Bussey re-examined.—The sister of the deceased, Mrs. Jay, was with her the whole of Thursday; in the course of which day, they both went to Covent-garden Market. They returned and took tea, and about six o'clock Mrs. Jay went away. In less than a quarter of an hour after, witness was called to the assistance of deceased, who was very sick, and who then first explained her situation to witness.

On cross-examination, she reluctantly confessed, that on the preceding Tuesday the same thing had been hinted to her by the deceased, who likewise stated; that her friend was displeased at it, and had said, she must go to a workhouse, as he could not support both. She likewise said something about poison. Witness observed no general change in her behaviour.

The Coroner said, the circumstance was a most melancholy one. One sister lay dead, and a second was in some degree implicated in the unfortunate transaction. The gentleman of the jury had heard the evidence, and it remained with them to come to a decision upon that evidence.

The room was then cleared, and after a deliberation of three hours, the following verdict was returned:—"That the deceased, Jane Mitchell, died from the effects of a vegetable poison, taken to procure abortion, and as is supposed by the advice of her sister, Sarah Jay; the deceased being of unsound mind when she took the said poison.

The Jury, at the same time, animadverted in very strong terms on the conduct of Mrs. Bussey, which they considered highly reprehensible.

The Coroner said the verdict in legal terms, was tantamount to that of "Wilful Murder" against Mrs. Jay, the sister, and it was his duty to commit her, to await the verdict of a higher tribunal. The beadle was then directed to take her to the New Prison, Clerkenwell.

OBSERVATIONS.

THE case of this young woman is but one of a thousand daily occurring. In spite of obstacles, the passion of love triumphs, and there is no evil but in the result, where results are allowed to follow. The mystery associated with and the sin imputed to the passion of love are productive of great misery. It should be fully understood and most free, when women are so well educated as to declare equality with and independence of mankind. Their degraded condition arises in a great measure from the mysterious veil which is thrown around the passion of love. Many a female submits to seduction through ignorance and from a desire to obtain knowledge on a subject on which she feels powerful sensations; when, had her education been proper, she would have been put fully on her guard against that seduction, and have preserved her honourable and virtuous feeling by not bartering love to a disadvantage, nor for the momentary gratification of another person.

My "Every Woman's Book" has now sold in its various editions to the extent of five thousand copies, with a continuing demand. I have found opinions of every description concerning it: but I am convinced, that it is one of the most useful books that has ever been published. I was fully aware, that I should stumble upon certain prejudices of certain persons; but a part and the largest part of my principles is, *hostility to prejudices*.

This warfare has nothing pleasant in it, beyond the sense of doing good ; for it every where incurs the ill will of the prejudiced ; allowing, per contra, that where and when the prejudices are removed, it makes firm, and fast, and grateful friends.

It should be observed, that prejudices exist only where mystery and ignorance are encouraged, and that the prejudice as well as the mystery is the ignorance. Where all are equally well informed of the quality of a thing, all agree. Where they differ is where there is an unequal degree of knowledge and generally where there is no knowledge. They wrangle for want of knowledge.

Had the young woman, whose melancholy case is here the subject of comment, known how to prevent the evil which had been allowed to accumulate, all would have passed well, and a virtuous member have been preserved to the community. The sense of shame and pain, which she expressed at her condition, affords proof that she retained a sense of virtue, that she preferred virtue to vice. Such a case is not confined to the poorer girls or young women, it is often found among those who have affluent means ; and it will be a great public, a great human, benefit, to make the passion of love a matter of free, chaste, and common conversation, shewing where and when it may be beneficially indulged and where and when its evils should be guarded against.

R. C.

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF ANTI-SUPERSTITIONISTS.

THE following Memoir is a specimen of the Biographical Dictionary of the Anti-superstitionists who have written against the Christian Superstition now publishing in Numbers :—

MARK AKENSIDE, M. D.

9 Nov. 1721,
at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

49¹

1770, June 23,
(in London.)

DR. AKENSIDE, in his *Pleasures of the Imagination*, “ has done for the noble author of the *Characteristics* what Lucretius did for Epicurus formerly : that is, he has displayed and embellished his philosophic system, that system which has the first beautiful and the first good for its foundation, with all the force of poetic colouring ; but, on the other hand, it has been justly objected, that

¹ Yet Chalmers and Lempriere say “ 59.”

his picture of man is unfinished."² The immortality of the soul is not once hinted throughout the poem. I think it may also be added, that there is scarcely any allusion to a revealed religion; and although the author seems to have been fully persuaded of the existence of a creator, yet his Deity is far more Platonic than Christian. Thus he says,

"So all things which have life aspire to God,
The sun of being, boundless, unimpair'd,
Center of souls!"

In a note to the third book, the author revived and maintained the notion of Shaftesbury, that ridicule is the test of truth. Warburton attacked him with severity in a preface; but Akenside was warmly defended in "An Epistle to the Rev. Mr. Warburton," which, although anonymous, was known to be the production of Mr. Jeremiah Dyson. "The Pleasures of the Imagination" were first published in 1744; and were acknowledged to be a very extraordinary production for a man who had not reached his 23rd year. It was translated into French by d'Holbach, and published at Amsterdam and Paris, 1769, 12mo.⁴ The *Dictionnaire Universel* says, that "the *Collection of Odes*, which was published soon after the *Pleasures of the Imagination*, is distinguished by the ardent passion for liberty and independence, which the author professed." The compiler of Mr. Hunt's Dictionary, after saying that the poem *On the Pleasures of the Imagination* raised the author at once into political eminence, continues: "This poem was rapidly followed by the *Epistle to Curio*, a warm invective against the political apostacy of the celebrated Pulteney, Earl of Bath; and in 1745, he published ten odes on various subjects, all of which labours distinguish him as a zealous votary of the Grecian intellectual philosophy, and an ardent lover of liberty."

These quotations must strongly prejudice one in favour of Akenside; yet, like the common herd of men, he seems to have become more timid as he grew older. In expunging about half of his epistle to Curio, and changing it into the form of an ode, I should have hoped, that he had only concentrated the bitterness of the satire; but, if I rightly understand Dr. Lempriere, it was not the weak part, but the strongest, namely, the philippic, which was expunged. Again: I cannot but consider it an act of cowardice in Akenside, that, when revising his "Pleasures of the Imagination," he omitted the lines and the note to which Warburton had objected. I have only the se-

² I extract this most barbarous sentence from Chalmers, p. 271.

³ Book II. v. 355.

⁴ Vid. Barbier Dict. des Anonymes, No. 5481.

venth edition⁵ of this poem, which as it was published eleven years after the first, had I suppose undergone the revision above alluded to. I am not therefore surprised at finding no verses upon Ridicule which could offend the bigots; there remain, however, some passages in the note to the 259th line of the third book, which, even now that we are half a century more enlightened, may be thought worthy of quotation. "To ask . . . whether *ridicule be a test of truth*, is, in other words, to ask whether that which is ridiculous can be *morally true*, can be just and becoming; or whether that which is just and becoming, can be ridiculous. A question that does not deserve a serious answer." Again, Akenside says: "In objects offered to the mind for its esteem or applause, the faculty of ridicule, finding an incongruity in the claim, urges the mind to reject it with laughter and contempt. When therefore we observe such a claim obtruded upon mankind, and the inconsistent circumstances carefully concealed from the eye of the public, it is our business, if the matter be of importance to society, to drag out those latent circumstances, and by setting them in full view, to convince the world how ridiculous the claim is; and thus a double advantage is gained; for we both detect the *moral falsehood* sooner than in the way of speculative inquiry, and impress the minds of men with a stronger sense of the vanity and error of its authors But it is said, the practice is dangerous, and may be inconsistent with the regard we owe to objects of real dignity and excellence. I answer, the practice fairly managed can never be dangerous; men may be dishonest in obtruding circumstances foreign to the subject, and we may be inadvertent in allowing those circumstances to impose upon us; but the sense of ridicule always judges right."

This doctrine of Akenside's is manifestly fatal to all miracles, &c. &c.

In his verse too as well as his prose, we meet with many liberal sentiments, as when he says,⁶

"I do not mean to wake the gloomy form
Of Superstition, dress'd in Wisdom's garb,
To damp your tender hopes; I do not mean
To bid the jealous thund'rer fire the heav'ns,
Or shapes infernal rend the groaning earth,
To fright you from your joys:—"

Let me add some lines, where the poet, after justly lamenting that the fine arts were for a long while totally subservient to kings and priests, adds⁷—

————— "Torquato's tongue
Was tuned for slavish pæans at the throne

⁵ London, printed for J. Dodsley, 1765.

⁶ Book I. v. 341.

⁷ Book II. v. 35.

Of tinsel pomp : and Raphael's magic hand
 Effused its fair creation to enchant
 The fond adoring herd in Latian fanes
 To bind belief : while on their prostrate necks
 The sable tyrant plants his heel secure."

I will give one more quotation, because therein the poet mentions, as he ought to do, that country, which, in morals, in metaphysics, and in the fine arts, has never been equalled:—

"⁸ Genius of ancient Greece ! whose faithful steps
 Well pleased I follow through the sacred paths
 Of nature and of science ; nurse divine
 Of all heroic deeds and fair desires !"

It may be imagined from my giving these passages from the "Pleasures of the Imagination," that I am extremely fond of this poem. But the contrary is the case. I admire, indeed, some detached parts ; but, as a whole, I consider it one of the dullest metrical compositions I ever looked into.

Yet it is considered⁹ one of the most finished models of blank verse. This is very probable : but I would limit blank verse to epic poetry and tragedy. A work on *the Imagination* ought to be written in light and easy rhyme, or in harmonious and flowery prose. Above all things it should be simple, although rapid : for notes explanatory of the meaning of each paragraph, section, or stanza, are only allowable in a Pindaric Ode like Gray's Progress of Poesy.

As the "Pleasures of the Imagination" are the only poem of Dr. Akenside's which I ever perused, I can say nothing of his other works ; but we are told,¹⁰ that his "Hymn to the Naiads" is a beautiful and classical production, and that his "Odes" possess copiousness and elevation of thought, although they are not by any means remarkable either for grace or harmony. Dr. Akenside's medical works are entirely out of my sphere ; but they are said to be respectable, and his discourse on the dysentery was admired for being written in pure and elegant Latin.

Dr. Akenside appears to have gained, as a medical practitioner, more honour than emolument. Thus : he was admitted, by mandamus, to a Doctor's degree at Cambridge, after having taken it at Edinburgh and Leyden ; he was elected a fellow of the College of Physicians, and one of the Physicians of St. Thomas' Hospital ; and he was appointed one of the Physicians to Queen Charlotte. But he was carried off by a putrid fever before he had amassed any fortune ; and probably the only repayment which his friend, Mr. Dyson, received, for having advanced him £300

⁸ Book I. v. 566.

⁹ By the compiler of Mr. Hunt's Dictionary.

¹⁰ Vid. Mr. Hunt's Dictionary.

a year in order to support his appearance as a London practitioner, was his succession to the effects of the deceased, and particularly to the books and prints, of which he had been an assiduous collector.

I consider it highly to the honour of Akenside, that, having gone to Edinburgh, at the age of eighteen, to qualify himself for the office of a dissenting minister, he repaid what he had received from the dissenter's fund, as soon as he had relinquished his original intention, and had determined to devote himself to medicine. He afterwards studied at Leyden: and I should conjecture (although without authority), that perhaps it was owing to his having passed the critical period of his life, at this foreign university, that he soon afterwards exhibited himself so liberal in his sentiments.

We are told, that it is Doctor Akenside who is ridiculed in Smollett's *Peregrine Pickle*, as the giver of a feast after the manner of the ancients. The Doctor was deemed haughty and ostentatious by his brethren of the faculty; and perhaps, even in private life, he was not endued with all the frankness of genuine modesty. For, although perpetually reminded, by a certain halt in his gait, of the fall of a cleaver from his father's stall, he is nevertheless said to have concealed from his friends, that he was the son of a butcher. This silence must surely be considered a mark of extreme vanity; especially if it be right to imagine, that, supposing any one to be obliged to choose a cut-throat for his father, it would, in these carnivorous times, be more honourable to be the son of a butcher than of a soldier.

BOOKS PUBLISHED.

ON a very shabby paper, we can supply Paine's "*Rights of Man*," in two Parts, at 2s. a copy.

We can also supply a common edition of Paine's "*Political Works*," in two Volumes, at 12s.: and, in consequence of having this common edition, we advance the price of the best from 20s. to 24s.—still a price that allows but a very moderate profit.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "*The Republican*," to be left at the place of publication.